

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 27, 2005, claims 1-4, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith et al. Applicant amends the claims to more particularly point out the present invention and distinguish it from Griffith et al. Specifically, applicant has amended claim 1 to require that the permeable body be a honeycomb that has walls that form or define cells, which extend laterally between the panel surfaces of the core. The walls have ends that form the panel surfaces to which the barrier is bonded.

Claim 1, as now amended, requires that the impermeable barrier be bonded to a honeycomb where the cells of the honeycomb are perpendicular to the barrier (i.e. the cells extend laterally between the panel surfaces). When the barrier is bonded to the honeycomb in this fashion, the honeycomb cells cannot be expanded by pulling the skins apart. Since the barrier is bonded to each end of the honeycomb wall, the cell walls will be stretched and fractured or the bond between the barrier and the honeycomb will be broken if the skins are pulled apart.

Applicant's structure, as now claimed, is substantially different from Griffith et al., which teaches that when the barrier is bonded to the honeycomb, the honeycomb cells must extend parallel to the skin surfaces. As shown in FIGS. 4-6 (and described at col. 8, line 61 to col. 9, line 15), an important feature of Griffith et al. is that when the barrier is bonded to the honeycomb, it must be done so that the honeycomb cells can be expanded by pulling the skins apart. Griffith et al. accomplishes this by arranging the honeycomb cells parallel to the skins. This is completely different from applicant's claimed invention where the honeycomb cells are oriented perpendicular to the skins such that expansion of the honeycomb cell by pulling the skins apart is not possible. Accordingly, applicant's invention is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of Griffith et al.

Applicant cancels claim 2 as being duplicative of claim 1, as now amended.

The above amendments are appropriate after final rejection because they do not raise any new issues that would require a further search. Instead, the amendments provide a more definite distinction between the present invention and Griffith et al., which places the claims in a better condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered and that the claims, as amended, be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2005

/David J. Oldenkamp/
David J. Oldenkamp, Reg. #29,421
SHAPIRO & DUPONT LLP
233 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Santa Monica, California 90401
(310) 319-5411 (Telephone)
(310) 319-5401 (Facsimile)